

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Claims**

Claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Further, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Figure 11, pages 6, 16 and 44-47, and cancelled claim 11 of the present application.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Plourde LaJoie, and Miura. Further, dependent claims 2-6, 9, 11 and 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plourde, LaJoie and Miura in view of various combinations of Beach, Young, Akamatsu, Hanai and Kobb. These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claim 1 and claims 2-6, 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including a reception means for receiving, as information indicating preprogrammed recording settings, a date of distribution, a time of distribution, an identification of a distribution source of distributed information to be

recorded, and an identification of an information recording medium for performing a preprogrammed recording of the distributed information. In addition, claim 1 recites displaying means for incorporating the received information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings into a two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of distribution, the time of distribution, and a plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto (the plurality of information recording mediums including the identified information recording medium).

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on the secondary Akamatsu reference for teaching the use of multiple recording mediums. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the operation of the claimed displaying means, it is submitted that Akamatsu fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features required by the displaying means, as now recited in claim 1.

Rather, Akamatsu merely teaches that recordings can be simultaneously performed onto a plurality of recording mediums (see Figs. 17 and 18 and col. 17, lines 12-47). Further, Akamatsu teaches that a table is displayed, such that information representing a scheduled recording identifies a recording medium onto which the scheduled recording is to be recorded (see Fig. 18, specifically the information under the column heading “execution”).

Thus, in view of the above, it is apparent that Akamatsu teaches that that information representing a scheduled recording identifies a recording medium onto which the scheduled recording is to be recorded, but fails to disclose or suggest incorporating the received information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings into a two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of distribution, the time of distribution, and a plurality of different

information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto (the plurality of different information recording mediums include the identified recording medium), as required by claim 1.

In other words, Akamatsu merely teaches that the appropriate recording medium is identified for each scheduled recording (see Fig. 18), but fails to disclose or suggest the two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of distribution, the time of distribution, and the plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto, as required by claim 1 (see, for example, Fig. 11, where matrix is defined by different information recording mediums (device/drive)).

Applicants note that the structure required by the claimed two-dimensional matrix (see for exemplary purposes only, the structure of the two-dimensional matrix illustrated in Fig. 11 of the present application) will allow a user to easily recognize, at a quick glance, which information recording medium is used for recording each program distribution, allowing the user to easily determine the state of and the future demands on each information recording medium. On the other hand, the structure of the table disclosed by Akamatsu does not provide the benefit of the structure required by claim 1, because the invention of Akamatsu does not allow the user to determine the state of and the future demands on each information recording medium, because Akamatsu fails to disclose or suggest the two-dimensional matrix is defined by the date of distribution, the time of distribution, and the plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that

independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Plourde, LaJoie and Miura in view of Akamatsu or any of the other secondary references.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Plourde, LaJoie, and Miura and/or Akamatsu or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Plourde, LaJoie, and Miura and/or Akamatsu to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, 9, and 13-21, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plourde, LaJoie, Miura in view of various combinations of Beach, Young, Akamatsu, Hanai and Kobb (secondary references), it is submitted that the secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Plourde, LaJoie and Miura references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Plourde, LaJoie and Miura with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-6, 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki KONDO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/  
By: 2009.11.12 14:45:35 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 12, 2009